

characteristic may sometimes be produced in adult birds by very marked wearing of the breast feathers. It also appears that immature birds complete their moult by December and that the birds collected by Traylor (1965) in fresh plumage in December were immature birds who had just completed their post-juvenile moult and were about to breed for the first time. The overall similarity to *L. mevesii* as described in Brooke (1967) is considerable.

A female Burchell's Starling shot on 2 May 1958 forty-one miles north-west of Molepolele in Botswana in fairly fresh plumage shows some symmetrical albinism: there is a single white feather at the back end of the black cheek patch; there are several minute white feathers below and behind the eye; there is one white feather on the side of the nape and two in the upper wing-coverts. The tenth (outermost) primary of the right wing is white whereas that on the left is normal.

I am obliged to the Curator, National Museum, Bulawayo, and to Mr. M. P. Stuart Irwin, Ornithologist there, for facilities for study and to the latter for criticizing a draft of this paper.

#### References:

- Benson, C. A. and Pitman, C. R. S. 1966. Further breeding records from Zambia (formerly Northern Rhodesia) (No. 5). *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 86: 21-33.  
 Brooke, R. K. 1967. On the moults and breeding season of the Long-tailed Starling *Lamprotornis mevesii* (Wahlberg). *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 87: 2-5.  
 Traylor, M. A. 1965. A collection of birds from Barotseland and Bechuanaland. *Ibis* 107: 357-384.

## On the type locality of *Campethera a. abingoni* (Smith)

by C. M. N. WHITE

Received 10th January, 1967

In *Bull. B.O.C.* 1965, 85, p. 64 Mr. Clancey considers that the type locality of *Campethera abingoni abingoni* (Smith) has been incorrectly accepted by ornithologists as Natal, and should be shifted to the western Transvaal with consequent changes of name of two forms of this woodpecker. Such changes of names which have been in use for decades are to be deplored and are, I believe, not warranted.

Clancey argues that the words after the description "occurs in the same localities with the last" must be construed as meaning Kurrichaine, *i.e.* Zeerust, western Transvaal because that was the locality given for the preceding species. In my view the words are ambiguous and need not have a geographical connotation at all. They could equally describe types of environment or could merely denote the fact that the two species of woodpecker occur sympatrically. Consequently I consider that Port Natal, the locality quoted in the footnote "specimens of this species were obtained near Port Natal" is the correct type locality.

Even if "the same localities with the last" is construed in a geographical sense, and considered on line priority to have precedence over the footnote, both localities occur on the same page and there is nothing to prevent the latter and only categorical locality being taken as the restricted type locality. The first reviser principle can be applied in this as it has in many other similar cases. If doubt still exists the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should be requested to rule that Port Natal is the correct type locality in accordance with the principle of conservation.